

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-56 were pending in the present application prior to this response. Claims 27-31 are allowed. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 16-26, 32-40 and 43-56 are rejected. Claims 6, 7, 13, 15, 41 and 42 are objected. Claims 1, 17, 22, 32, 36, 43 and 52 were amended. Claims 36-42 and 52-56 are canceled. Reconsideration of the rejections of all claims is requested.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 16-26, 32-40, and 43-56 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 16-26, 32-40, and 43-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,030 (Barry et al.).

**CLAIM 1**

Claim 1, as amended herein, is directed toward:

An electronic device, comprising:  
a display, wherein an image is displayable on said display; and  
a navigation sensor, whereby movement of said electronic device relative to a surface in close proximity to said navigation sensor is sensed by said navigation sensor and said movement includes moving said display and said movement produces a change in said image that is showing on said display.

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed by Barry et al. have been replicated above in bold type.

As indicated in the office action, Barry et al. discloses a computer system including a monitor and a mouse, which are all separate devices. Movement of the

mouse causes an image displayed on the monitor to change. There is no disclosure related to moving the monitor along with the mouse to cause the displayed image to change. As discussed below, such a requirement, in addition to other requirements, would be needed in order for Barry et al. to be even somewhat applicable.

Claim 1 states that the electronic device comprises a display and a navigation sensor. Claim 1 further states that the movement includes moving the electronic device, which includes the display. Accordingly, movement of the electronic device includes movement of the navigation sensor and the display. The movement of the electronic device produces a change in the image that is displayed on the display.

The applicant respectfully notes that the display disclosed in Barry et al. does not move. In order for Barry et al. to be applicable, the mouse and the monitor would have to move together as a single electronic device. Such a movement is not disclosed or even suggested by Barry et al.

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 1 and cannot render claim 1 obvious. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 2-5

Claims 2-5 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

#### CLAIM 8

Claim 8 is directed toward:

An electronic device, comprising:

a display;

a navigation sensor coupled to said display whereby said navigation sensor detects a movement of said electronic

**device relative to a surface in close proximity to said navigation sensor and said movement includes movement of said display and an image displayed on said display is altered in response to said movement.**

Some portions of claim 8 that are not disclosed by Barry et al. have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 8 includes an electronic device that comprises a display and a navigation sensor. The navigation sensor detects movement of the electronic device which includes movement of the display. The image on the display is altered in response to the movement.

As discussed above, Barry et al. discloses a computer system that includes a monitor and a mouse, which are separate and individual devices. The movement of the mouse causes an image displayed on the monitor to change. However, there is no disclosure related to moving the monitor. Just as in claim 1, in order for Barry et al. to be even somewhat applicable, the mouse and the monitor would have to move together as a single electronic device. Such movement is not disclosed or even suggested in Barry et al.

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 8. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 9-12, 14, and 16

Claims 9-12, 14, and 16 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 8. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**CLAIM 17**

Claim 17 as amended herein, is directed toward:

A method of manipulating an image displayed by a device on a display, said method comprising:

**moving the entire device including said display** relative to a surface upon which said device is placed;  
**detecting movement of said entire device relative to said surface; and**  
**manipulating said image based on said movement.**

Some portions of claim 17 that are not disclosed by Barry et al. have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 17 includes moving the entire device including the display to manipulate an image on a display.

In Barry et al. the monitor, which is the display, does not move relative to a surface. Rather the mouse is the only device that moves so as to manipulate the image displayed on the monitor.

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 17. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

**CLAIMS 18-21**

Claims 18-21 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 17. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

## CLAIM 22

Claim 22 as amended herein, is directed toward:

A method of manipulating an image displayed on a display, said method comprising:

**detecting a movement of a device that includes said display**  
wherein said movement is detected relative to a surface in contact with said device; and,  
altering said image in response to said movement.

Some portions of claim 22 that are not disclosed by Barry et al. have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 22 includes detecting a movement of a device that includes the display. The image on the display is thus altered in response to the movement.

In Barry et al. the monitor which is the display does not move to manipulate the image on the monitor. The mouse is the only device that moves in order to manipulate the image on the monitor. Thus, Barry does not disclose, among other elements of claim 22 "detecting movement of a device that includes said display."

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 22. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

## CLAIMS 23-26

Claims 23-26 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 22. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**CLAIM 32**

Claim 32 as amended herein, is directed toward:

A method of previewing a scanned image, said method comprising:  
displaying a first part of a scanned image;  
displaying a second part of said scanned image in response  
to relative movement between a scanning device and a surface in close  
proximity to said scanning device.

According to the Office Action, the Examiner has interpreted the mouse in Barry et al. as a scanner. The Examiner has failed to show how the mouse in Barry et al. is used as a scanner or is able to scan.

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 32. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

**CLAIMS 33-35**

Claims 33-35 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 32. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**CLAIM 43**

Claim 43 as amended herein, is directed toward:

An electronic device comprising:  
a display located on a first side of said electronic device;  
a navigation sensor located on a second side of said  
electronic device, said second side being opposite said first side,  
wherein said navigation sensor detects movement of a part of a user

relative to said navigation sensor located in close proximity to said navigation sensor, and wherein an image displayed on said display is altered in response to said movement of said part of said user relative to said navigation device.

Some portions of claim 43 that are not disclosed by Barry et al. have been replicated above in bold type.

Claim 43 includes an electronic device that has a display on a first side and a navigation sensor on an opposite side. In Barry et al. the computer system consist of a mouse and display that are separate and individual devices. Therefore, Barry et al. does not disclose "a display located on a first side of said electronic device; a navigation sensor located on a second side of said electronic device" as claimed in claim 43.

Accordingly, Barry et al. does not teach or even suggest all the elements of claim 43. The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

#### CLAIMS 44-51

Claims 44-51 are allowable by way of their dependence on allowable claim 43. Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections.

#### II. Objection to Claims 6, 7, 13 and 15

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 15 were objected to as being dependent on rejected base claims and would be allowed if written in independent form. The applicant contends that the base claims are allowable and, thus, the aforementioned claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants request reconsideration of all rejected claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

Dated: April 27, 2004

By: RW Nelson  
Robert W. Nelson  
Reg. No: 37,898  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 298-9888  
Fax: (303) 297-2266